



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/838,239 | 04/20/2001 | Srikanth Natarajan | 10007591/020 | 9191 |

7590 07/24/2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

SHAW, PELING ANDY

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2144

DATE MAILED: 07/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/838,239 | NATARAJAN ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Peling A. Shaw | 2144 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

pas

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 05/05/2006 has been entered. Claims 1 and 8 are amended. Claims 1-8 are still pending.
2. Amendment received on 11/08/2005 was entered. Claims 1 and 8 were amended. Claims 1 and 8 were previously amended on 06/15/2005.

Priority

3. This application has no priority claim made. The filing date is 04/20/2001.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, first paragraph

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the original specification and claims in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

- a. Claims 1 and 8 are amended with change of “...and a trust flag to indicate a binary setting relating to the management domain identifier ...”, “... deciding whether the at least one management computer should resolve the management domain identifier based on the binary setting of the trust flag ...” and “...the at least one management computer being capable of deciding whether to resolve the management domain identifier on behalf of the collection computers based on the binary setting of the trust flag ...” that are not found in the original specification or claim language. The trust flag and management domain identifier are not related as according to amended claim language, particularly the resolution of management domain identifier does not depend upon the trust flag setting. The trust flag setting is for hostname resolution per applicant’s specification. These changes modify the scope of the invention and introduce new subject matter into the application. It would require undue experimentation for one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made to be able to add and test all these functions inclusively rather than just pick a particular function for implementation. Claims 1, 8 and their depending claims 2-7 are rejected. For the purpose of applying art, the amended limitations, i.e. “... deciding whether the at least one management computer should resolve the management domain identifier based on the binary setting of the trust flag ...” and “...the at least one management computer being capable of deciding whether to resolve the management domain identifier on behalf of the collection computers based on the binary setting of the trust flag ...” will be read as “... deciding whether the at least one management computer should resolve the management domain

identifier ...” and “... the at least one management computer being capable of deciding whether to resolve the management domain identifier on behalf of the collection computers ...”.

Appropriate corrections are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lecheler et al. (WO 00/49769), hereinafter referred as Lecheler, in view of Nelson et al. (US 5577252 A), hereinafter referred as Nelson.

- a. Lecheler shows (claim 1) a method of managing a computer network, comprising the steps of: assigning to at least one collection computer a management domain identifier uniquely associated with a management domain in which each collection computer resides; receiving, in at least one management computer (Fig. 3, item 92: network node manager), information from the at least one collection computer that includes the management domain identifier; and maintaining within the at least one management computer a database (Fig. 3, item 84: mapping table) of the information accessed using the management domain identifier (Title, Abstract, Figures 1 and 3, page 10 lines 7-19, page 13 lines 20-23). Lecheler does not explicitly show (claim 1)

a trust flag to indicate a binary setting relating to the management domain identifier and deciding whether the at least one management computer should resolve the management domain identifier. However Lecheler does show exploration of art and/or provided a reason to modify the method of managing a computer network with additional features such as the trust/security feature (page 5 lines 2-11, page 19 lines 11-17).

- b. Nelson shows (claim 1) a method of managing a computer network wherein at least one management computer receives information from a computer collection that includes a trust flag to indicate a binary setting relating to the management domain identifier and deciding whether the at least one management computer should resolve the management domain identifier (column 1 line 54-column 2 line 2; column 6 line 62-column 7 line 18; column 9 lines 1-23; column 11 line 65- column 12, line 2: name resolution based upon trust) in an analogous art for the purpose of implementing secure name servers in an object-oriented system.
- c. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Lecheler's functions of remote management of private networks having duplicate network addresses with Nelson's functions of name resolution based on trust.
- d. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include the name resolution based on trust technique per Nelson's teaching in management systems per Lecheler and Nelson's teaching.

- e. Regarding claim 2, Lecheler shows wherein the step of assigning comprises the step of: establishing at least one management domain, wherein each management domain includes at least one collection computer (Figures 1 and 3, page 8 lines 10-31, page 12 lines 7-20).
- f. Regarding claim 3, Lecheler shows wherein the management domain identifier is a domain name of the management domain (page 10 line 26-page 11 line 13).
- g. Regarding claim 4, Lecheler shows wherein the information is network topology information (page 13 lines 14-23, page 15 lines 13-28, page 18 lines 3-11).
- h. Regarding claim 7, Lecheler shows comprising the step of: managing, by each collection computer, at least one network object; and resolving, by each collection computer, a network address of each network object into a resolved network address included in the information received at the at least one management computer (page 10 lines 7-19, page 15 lines 13-28).
- i. Claim 8 is of the same scope as claim 1. It is rejected for the same reasons as for claim 1.

Together Lecheler and Nelson disclosed all limitations of claims 1-4 and 7-8. Claims 1-4 and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

- 2. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pulsipher et al. (US 5948055 A), hereinafter referred as Pulsipher, in view of Nelson et al. (US 5577252 A), hereinafter referred as Nelson.

- a. Pulsipher shows (claim 1) a method of managing a computer network, comprising the steps of: assigning to at least one a collection computer a management domain

identifier uniquely associated with a management domain in which each collection computer resides; receiving, in at least one management computer, information from the at least one collection computer that includes the management domain identifier and a trust flag relating to the management domain identifier; and maintaining within the at least one management computer a database of the information accessed using the management domain identifier (Figures 2-5, column 3 lines 16-32, column 7 lines 41-57, column 8 lines 7-24, column 10 lines 13-25). Pulsipher does not explicitly show (claim 1) a trust flag to indicate a binary setting relating to the management domain identifier and deciding whether the at least one management computer should resolve the management domain identifier. However Pulsipher does show exploration of art and/or provided a reason to modify the method of managing a computer network with additional features such as the trust/security feature (column 17 lines 38-51, column 31 lines 50-61).

- b. Nelson shows (claim 1) a method of managing a computer network wherein at least one management computer receives information from a computer collection that includes a trust flag to indicate a binary setting relating to the management domain identifier and deciding whether the at least one management computer should resolve the management domain identifier (column 1 line 54-column 2 line 2; column 6 line 62-column 7 line 18; column 9 lines 1-23; column 11 line 65- column 12, line 2: name resolution based upon trust) in an analogous art for the purpose of implementing secure name servers in an object-oriented system.

- c. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Pulsipher's functions of distributed internet monitoring system with Nelson's functions of name resolution based on trust.
- d. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include the name resolution based on trust technique per Nelson's teaching in management systems per Pulsipher and Nelson's teaching.
- e. Regarding claim 2, Pulsipher shows wherein the step of assigning comprises the step of: establishing at least one management domain, wherein each management domain includes at least one collection computer (Figure 2, column 6 lines 11-19, column 6 line 65-column 7 line 21).
- f. Regarding claim 3, Pulsipher shows wherein the management domain identifier is a domain name of the management domain (column 10 lines 13-25).
- g. Regarding claim 4, Pulsipher shows wherein the information is network topology information (Abstract, Figures 2-3B, column 6 lines 52-64, column 7 lines 41-57).
- h. Regarding claim 5, Pulsipher shows wherein the step of receiving comprises the steps of: receiving first information from a first collection computer, wherein the first information includes a first network address and a first management domain identifier; receiving second information from a second collection computer, wherein the second information includes a second network address and a second management domain identifier, wherein the second network address is identical to the first network address; comparing the second network address to the first network address using the second management domain identifier and the first management domain identifier;

assigning a network element associated with the second network address as a primary network element when the second network address belongs to a different management domain than the first network address; and assigning the network element associated with the second network address as a secondary network element when the second network address belongs to a same management domain as the first network address (Figure 2, Figures 8A-8B, Figures 13-15B, column 6 line 65-column 7 line 21, column 10 lines 13-25, column 11 lines 20-31, column 15 lines 33-48).

- i. Regarding claim 6, Pulsipher shows wherein the step of maintaining comprises the step of: using management domain identifiers to consolidate network topology information from collection computers having identical network addresses and belonging to different management domains (Figure 2, column 6 line 65-column 7 line 21).
- j. Regarding claim 7, Pulsipher shows comprising the step of: managing, by each collection computer, at least one network object; and resolving, by each collection computer, a network address of each network object into a resolved network address included in the information received at the at least one management computer (column 9 line 56-column 10 line 7, column 10 lines 13-25, column 11 lines 8-31).
- k. Claim 8 is of the same scope as claim 1. It is rejected for the same reasons as for claim 1.

Together Pulsipher and Nelson disclosed all limitations of claims 1-8. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed on 05/05/2006 with respect to pending claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
 - a. Applicant's arguments are based upon the amended changes to claim language. The above new ground of claim rejections under U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph disallow the amended claim language changes. Thus the applicant arguments do not apply to the current office action.

Art Unit: 2144

Remarks

4. The following pertaining arts are discovered and not used in this office action. Office reserves the right to use these arts in later actions.

- a. Sugauchi et al. (US 6041349 A) System management/network correspondence display method and system therefor

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Refer to the enclosed PTO-892 for details.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peling A. Shaw whose telephone number is (571) 272-7968. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William C. Vaughn can be reached on (571) 272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

pas

pas


WILLIAM VAUGHN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100